



80/272/RVN

RESULT OF VOTING ON NEW WORK ITEM PROPOSAL

IEC/TC or SC 80	Date of circulation 2000-06-23
Allocated project number 80/61162-3/Ed. 1	
Reference number of the proposal 80/253/NP	Title of the TC or SC concerned Maritime navigation and radiocommunication equipment and systems
Title of proposal: IEC 61162: Maritime navigation and radiocommunication equipment and systems - Digital Interfaces - Part 3: Serial data instrument network.	

Voting results — to be completed by the secretariat and sent to the Central Office for distribution

P-members having identified a market need and supporting the addition of the new work item to the programme of work	P-members having nominated an expert	P-members not supporting the addition of the proposed new work item to the programme of work	P-members abstaining
Belgium Canada China Denmark Egypt France Germany Italy Japan Netherlands Norway Sweden U.S.A. United Kingdom	Canada Germany Japan Norway Sweden U.S.A. United Kingdom		Finland
			P-members not replying Romania Russian Federation
Total: 14	Total: 7	Total:	Total: 3

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposal is supported by a simple majority of the P-members voting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least 25% of the P-members, but at least 4 P-members, have nominated or confirmed the name of an expert
Under the voting criteria for the acceptance of new work items (see ISO/IEC Directives, Part 1, 2.3.5)	
<input type="checkbox"/> the proposal is not approved	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> the proposal is approved and the new work item has been introduced in the programme of work under the following title: IEC 61162: Maritime navigation and radiocommunications equipment and systems - Digital Interfaces - Part 3: Serial data instrument network.	
(Titre F):	
The project is assigned to project team/working group no. ...WG6... name of project leader ..M P Fox (UK).....	
Draft attached to form 4 will be	<input type="checkbox"/> circulated as a CD <input type="checkbox"/> discussed (with comments annexed) on [Date] <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> circulated as a CDV
Proposed target date for submission of a CD:	CDV: 2000-12 FDIS: 2001-06 IS: 2001-12
The date and place of the first PT or WG meeting are: or arrangements for electronic operations are annexed <input type="checkbox"/> .	
The list of experts nominated is annexed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> .	
Proposals for further modifications are given in annex A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Secretariat United Kingdom	Name or signature of secretary M. A. Rambaut
-------------------------------	---

ANNEX

Experts nominated by their Countries

Canada:

Mr. Paul Vale,
Promaxis Systems Inc.,
2385 St Laurent Blvd.,
Ottawa Ontario, Canada
K1 G 6C3
Ph: 613-737-2112, Fax: 613-737 0229 email pvale@promaxis.com,

Norman b Cook ,

Atlantic communications,
PO Box 341, St. John's NF. Canada
A1C 5J9,
PH: 709-720-4443, FX: 709-753-6400 Email: e-csel@CSEL.nf.ca

Germany:

Mr. Hans-H. Leszke,
Raytheon Marine GmbH,
Abt. VAE,
Zeyestrasse 16-24,
D-24106 Kiel,
Tel. +49 (0)431/30 19-3 73, Fax +49 (0)431/30 19-8 63, e-mail: hhleszke@anschuetz.com

Japan:

Mr. Nobuo Aritake,
Engineering Department 1,
Marine Electronics Division
Japan Radio Co., Ltd.,
5-1-1, Shimorenjaku,
Mitaka-si,
Tokyo 181-8510, Japan,
j04477!aritime@m1.jrc.co.jp., Tel: 422-45-9049, Fax: 422-45-9957

Norway:

Mr. Ornulf Jan Rodseth, Norwegian Member of WG 6

Sweden

Mr Anders Jangö, Swedish member of WG 6

U.S.A.:

Lee Luft
USCG R&D Center
1082 Shennecossett Road
Groton, Connecticut
Ph: 860-441-2685 Fax: 860-441-2792 Email: Lluft@rdc.uscg.mil

United Kingdom:

M P Fox Convenor WG6

Annex A

Date March 2000	Document 80/253/NP
--------------------	-----------------------

National Committee	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph Figure/ Table	Type of comment (General/ Technical/Editorial)	COMMENTS	Proposed change	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
GB	General			<p>The British committee is generally in favour of this proposal, The standard concerns on-board electrical installation, but it makes no reference to the work of IEC TC18. The NP should be revised to identify the need for co-ordination with TC18. There is concern that this standard may call upon the use of specialised cable types which would not be generally acceptable for marine use. It is of concern that a standard for data communications, the very mechanism by which previously disparate systems might be integrated, should take no account of the wider context of use on ships and the complementary work of other committees.</p> <p>Appropriate (normative) references should be added to relevant TC18 standards, particularly IEC 60092-504 and 60533 which will impact upon installation aspects. Note that a revision of IEC 60092-504 will soon be available, which expands upon the IMO guidelines for computers and establishes criteria for data networks.</p>		

National Committee	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph Figure/ Table	Type of comment (General/ Technical/Editorial)	COMMENTS	Proposed change	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
				<p>Consideration should also be given to liaison with ISO TC8 SC10, who may be able to provide valuable input on the 'process' aspects, e.g. development and implementation for dependability in use, noting that testing is of limited benefit when considering system integration.</p> <p>A number of normative references relate to ISO standards for agricultural machinery, and similarly for road vehicles. While it is accepted that their content may be relevant to marine needs in many respects, it should be recognised that the safe operation of any network based system depends fundamentally on the protocols employed. It cannot be assumed that the factors relevant to other applications will yield a safe marine system. (Note that it is implicit in many standards that shutdown on failure is a 'safe state' - of little benefit should an on-board system fail in use at a crucial moment.) This must be investigated in some depth to ensure that the protocols can fulfil marine needs and requirements.</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate to make normative reference to proprietary documents outside the standards community, particularly where their relevance is questionable. If it is the case that these documents are essential, then the issue of patents and IPR must be reconsidered.</p> <p>It should not be implied that the standard may be suitable for any other type of application over which TC80 has no remit, and due care should be exercised, e.g. in the introduction and scope. The limitations imposed by the title are however noted</p>		